

researches in Oriental archæology. One of these has just been published by Dr. Winckler,<sup>1</sup> and gives a general review of what we have learned from the monuments about the ancient history of Western Asia.

It is needless to say that it is admirably done. Dr. Winckler is abreast of the latest discoveries, to which he has himself contributed no small share; he is not afraid to put forward new views, however daring and revolutionary, or to adopt the opinions of others when they seem to him to be right; and he never leaves us in doubt as to what he means. In a few short but luminous pages the whole history of the ancient East is sketched as we now know it to have been: the Sumerians and their Semitic successors, the Canaanites and Aramæans, the Arabs and Sabæans, the Hittites and their northern kinsmen, the proto-Armenians and Elamites,—all alike pass before our view. The account of the Hittites and their wanderings is especially noteworthy, and throws light on one of

<sup>1</sup> *Die Völker Vorderasiens*. By Hugo Winckler. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899.

the dark corners of history, while the suggestion that the Leucosyri or 'White Syrians' of Strabo really denote the Lukki and Suri of the monuments is very attractive. So, too, is the ingenious identification of Bartatua of Askuza or Ashchenaz with the Scythian Protohyes of Herodotus, though it must be remembered that the name may be read Maztatua as well as Bartatua, and regarded as compounded with the name of the Persian god Mazda. On the other hand, Dr. Winckler seems to me to have proved that Mita, king of the Moschi, the antagonist of Sargon, is the same as the Phrygian Midas of Greek tradition. The identification is important in view of the Hittite monuments that exist near 'the city of Midas,' on the banks of the Sangarius—a name, by the way, which claims affinity to that of Sangara, the Hittite king of Carchemish.

On one or two points only should I be inclined to differ from Dr. Winckler. I believe that he antedates the predominance of the Semitic element in Babylonia, and I fail to see any support for the view that Anzan was the Media of the Greeks.

---

## Requests and Replies.

Kindly inform me what are the best authorities for a study of the doctrine of the Trinity, especially in its Old Testament development.—G. J. R.

THE doctrine of GOD as revealed in the O.T. may be studied in such introductions as those of Oehler and Schultz. When it appears, Dr. A. B. Davidson's *Theology of the Old Testament* (in 'The International Theological Library') will probably be the most useful book of its kind in English; meanwhile, some help may be found in his article, 'God (in O.T.),' Hastings' *D.B.* vol. ii.

It is, of course, to the N.T. that the student will look for direct revelations as to the existence of distinctions in the Being of GOD. He should begin by reading afresh St. John's Gospel, with Westcott's commentary, and then proceed to the Pauline Epistles, where he will be aided by Lightfoot on Philippians and Colossians, and by Sanday and Headlam on Romans. From the N.T. he

will go to the Greek and Latin writers of the fourth century, and read Athanasius on the Incarnation, Basil on the Holy Spirit, the theological orations of Gregory of Nazianzus, and part of the great work of Augustine on the Trinity. He may pursue the history of his subject in Dorner's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, or Ottley's *Doctrine of the Incarnation*. A more dogmatic treatment of the doctrine will be found in Canon Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, and Canon Gore's Bampton Lectures for 1891; its philosophical aspect is unfolded in Mr. Illingworth's *Personality, Human and Divine*, and *Divine Immanence*.

The literature is enormous. But the student who begins with the course which I have ventured to indicate will have laid a secure foundation for further study.

H. B. SWETE.

Cambridge.

Will you furnish some explanation of the expression which is found in Am viii. 14: 'The manner of Beersheba liveth'?—E. St. J. W.

THE whole verse according to the Authorized Version is, 'They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy God, O Dan, liveth; and, The manner of Beersheba liveth.' This translation comes from the Geneva Bible of 1560, which contains a marginal note: 'That is, the commune maner of worshiping and the service or religion there used.' The Hebrew word is thus taken in the sense of 'ritual,' 'cult,' 'manner of worship,'

and that it is just possible to take it so is shown by the fact that elsewhere it is sometimes rendered 'manner' in the sense of custom. Thus Am 4<sup>10</sup>: 'I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt.' But the ordinary meaning of the word (דָרַךְ) is 'way,' 'road,' 'path,' and Driver prefers its usual translation, quoting from G. A. Smith and Doughty as to the Arabic custom of swearing by the way to a place. This is probably what is intended by the R.V. 'the way of Beersheba liveth.'

EDITOR.

## Professor Margoliouth and the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

THE request of the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES that I would review Professor Margoliouth's pamphlet on *The Origin of the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus* reached me when I was engrossed with other work. I have readily turned from this, however, because it is important to arrive at a verdict on the question Margoliouth raises. I must add that I should gladly have devoted somewhat longer time to the examination of the subject, but the interest of the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has been so powerfully awakened by the July number (p. 433 f.), that I have determined to communicate in the August issue the results I have reached up till now. In what follows I will use for the Hebrew text published by Cowley and Neubauer the symbol H, and for the Greek and Syriac versions of Ecclus. the symbols G and S respectively.

An important principle to be observed in the examination of the question appears to me to be this, that in the first instance only the *text* of H furnishes the object of investigation. The marginal notes are a matter by themselves, and have only a secondary claim to be taken into account. It is confusing when at one time something from the text and at another a marginal note is brought under notice—a fault in form which Margoliouth has not entirely avoided (cf. p. 3 f., 6).

1. It is the natural course to look at the text first of all from the point of view of *quantity*. Margoliouth has not touched upon this at all, and all that Schechter (in Cowley and Neubauer, p. xii) says about it is that 'The Hebrew omits whole clauses which are to be found both in the Greek and in the Syriac. Certain clauses, again, are to be found in H which are wanting in both versions.' But even Schechter neither gives examples nor devotes any special discussion to the bearing of this quantitative relation of H, G, and S upon the originality of H.

Now, the *plus* of H, as compared with G and S, is made up, apart from particular words, of 39<sup>20b, 30c</sup> 40<sup>9b</sup> 41<sup>9a</sup> 45<sup>7e, 25f</sup> 46<sup>19a</sup>. Have these passages the marks of secondary origin? In the first place, the question, 'Is there a number to his salvation?' (39<sup>20b</sup>) was not so natural a one as to awaken the suspicion that it is an interpolation.<sup>1</sup> Again, is the remark that the wild beasts, etc. (39<sup>30ab</sup>), were 'created for their use' (v.<sup>30c</sup>) of such a kind that anyone would feel disposed to insert it? Further, 'pestilence and bloodshed, fever and drought,' as

<sup>1</sup> Regarding Smend's reading ('Das hebräische Fragment der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach,' in *Abhandl. d. Götting. Gesells. d. Wissensch.*, 1897) of 39<sup>20b</sup> I reserve my judgment, but his view that מַשְׁחָה is a substantive derived from מַשַּׁח appears to me extremely uncertain.